

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Draft Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

NUMBER	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	<p>Appendix L-2, FBR Template ([Page L-A2-1]; instructions provided in Section L, 8.0 Volume IV – Price Proposal [Page L-36]): The first paragraph at the top of page L-38 indicates that the prime is required to provide a composite FBR for overtime for each SLC. Instructions are not clear on how the prime is to show the details of generating a team-wide composite rate for overtime by SLC. Recommend duplicating the FBR Template and re-naming the first template “FBR ST” for straight time rates and the second template “FBR OT” for overtime rates. Without a separate template, it will be very difficult to present a clear picture of how a team-wide composite overtime rate is calculated. The separate overtime template will give the Government visibility into the major subcontractors’ overtime rates as well as the calculation of the composite overtime rate by SLC at the prime.</p>	<p>As the Draft RFP states, the last column to the right of this template addresses the Composite Overtime Prime and Subcontractor FBR per Hour. The offeror must be clear on how the overtime FBR was calculated in their narrative with a discussion and also, as with the rest of the template, include the formula within the cell to demonstrate the calculation.</p> <p>The Government will not provide an additional template for calculating the Composite Overtime Premium. As per the instructions, the Offeror shall provide a discussion on how these rates were calculated. In addition, the Offeror shall include the formula within the cell to demonstrate how the Composite Overtime Rate was calculated.</p>
2	<p>Appendix L-2, SPT (Page L-A2-2) and Appendix L-6, Table L-3 (Page L-A6-4): In the SPT tab of the Section L Cost Template file and in Table L-3, there is a Manager I labor category. This labor category is not included in the FBR Template (Page L-A2-1) or Table L-1 Standard Labor Categories (Page L-A5-2). Should the category be included in the FBR and Table L-1?</p>	<p>The Fully Burdened Rate (FBR) template will be modified to include Manager I. In addition, the definition of Manager I will be incorporated in Table L-1 Standard Labor Categories.</p>
3	<p>Section L, Part II, 4.TA1 (Page L-21): This section states that “the offerors shall address not only the specific labor resources but also your supporting rationale, BOE, and assumptions for</p>	<p>The intent of the Government is not to duplicate the same information in two different places. If the Offeror finds it</p>

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Draft Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	<p>estimating the amount and skill mix of those resources as well as the technical approach for accomplishing the SOW areas as referenced by “R”.”</p> <p>If the requested information were provided at the roll-up level, it would be redundant with the information provided at the detail “D” level per TA2. For example, SOW 1.2 is designated as an “R”. In the SOW, Section 1.2 is only a title (Business Management) – subsequent sections (i.e., 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5) contain the requirements. Does the Government intend for us to provide the same information in two different places within the Technical Approach section (e.g., once in TA1 and again in TA2)? This would severely constrain what we are able to communicate within the page count allowed by the solicitation. Would the Government allow us to address the “R” levels in TA2 instead?</p>	<p>necessary for the Government to better understand their proposal, the offeror can provide a pointer to the “D”, or detailed, areas which apply.</p> <p>The Government does not intend for the “R” levels to be addressed in TA2.</p> <p>The TA1 “R” should be discussed as horizontal integration activities. The key technical activities and labor resources that apply contract-wide within the contract, as well as technical integration activities with other ISS Program contractors and International Partners should be discussed in “R”.</p> <p>The TA2 “D” should be discussed as vertical integration or as “down and in” technical requirement and labor resources.</p>
4	<p>Section L, Part II, 5.B (Page L-26): The Section L instruction refers to Section H, Clause H.7 for identification of “performance areas”. Clause H.7 does not provide identification of the subject “performance areas”. Is the Government going to define these “performance areas” or should this requirement be deleted</p>	<p>The performance areas are identified in NFS 1842.15 as referenced in Section H, Clause H.7, paragraph (b).</p>
5	<p>Appendix L-5, Table L-2 (Page L-A5-4): SOW element 3.2, Visiting Vehicles, is currently listed as an “R,” but there are no lower level elements to roll up to the 3.2 level. Should it be listed as a “D”?</p>	<p>Given the level of requirements in the Statement of Work Section 3.2, Visiting Vehicles, the Government does not require a detailed response.</p>
6	<p>Appendix L-3, Sample Task Order #2 (Page L-A3-15): Sample Task Order #2 indicates a software CM task under SOW 1.3.1.4. The</p>	<p>The software CM task is deleted from the Statement of Work and Task Order 1.3.1.4.</p>

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Draft Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	referenced SOW paragraph (and software CM tasking) does not exist in the DRFP SOW. Will a software CM task be added to the SOW?	
7	Section L, Part I, L.12.(b) (Page L-14): Would the Government be receptive to having all of the materials due on January 22, 2009 (Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors; Volume III Past Performance Proposal; and the CAOT Template) be submitted in the same binder?	<p>Refer to Section L Part I, L.12 (b): Offerors submission of proposals are due no later than 1:30 p.m., CST on February 9, 2009, except for Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors, Volume III Past Performance Proposal, and Past Performance Questionnaires which are due no later than 1:30 p.m. CST on January 22, 2009.</p> <p>No, the Government prefers that the volumes be submitted in separate binders. Refer to Section L Part II Paragraph 1.0 (Page L-18): "The four volumes identified above shall be separately bound in appropriately sized 3-ring binders that permit the volume to lie flat when open."</p>
8	Section L, Part II, Table in 1.0 (Page L-17): How would the Government like us to provide the Ostensible Subcontractor Approach? Should it be in a separate binder? Should it be grouped with the Model Contract? How many copies should be provided?	The Government does not require a separate binder for the Ostensible Subcontractor Approach. The Government does not require that it be grouped with the Model Contract. Other Required Data copy submission should be the same as Volume II referenced in Section L, Part II, 2.0 General, A. Copies Of Proposals.
9	Section L, Part II, 5.F (Page L-30): Could the Government please clarify what is being	The Government request that the offeror: 1) provide its

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Draft Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	<p>requested for the IT Management and Security Plans portion of the Plans Volume and, if these plans are not being requested as part of the proposal, when these plans are due? The description in Section L, Part II, 5.F (Page L-30) appears to ask for our approach to IT Management and IT Security but not for the actual IT Management Plan or the actual IT Security Plan. Consistent with this, DRD PIC-IT-01 (Page J-A1-11) indicates that the IT Management Plan is due 30 days after contract start and DRF PIC-IT-03 (Page J-A1-18) indicates that the IT Security Plan and Reports is due in June 2010. However, the cover page for Attachment J-4, IT Security Plan, (Page J-A4-1) indicates that the IT Security Plan is to be proposed by offerors (i.e., submitted with the proposal) and Section G.12, Milestone 4 (Page G-12) indicates that the IT Security Plan is due during the Phase-in Period but does not mention the IT Management Plan. Section L, Part II, 5.C (Page L-27) indicates that the IT Management Plan is due during the Phase-in Period but does not mention the IT Security Plan. Does the reference in Section 5.F to DRD PIC-IT-01 and DRD PIC-IT-03 indicate that the Government would like the plans described in those DRDs to be submitted with the proposal?</p>	<p>approach for coordinating and executing all technical and administrative tasks for all activities required to manage ISS Program IT resources and interfaces with other ISS Program and institutional IT providers, 2) discuss its approach for establishing and maintaining IT security requirements, reference DRD PIC-IT-03, and 3) discuss its proposed life cycle methodology that encompasses all life cycle phases for IT systems and applications. This information should be included in Section J, Attachment J-4, IT Management and Security Plans. The attachment J-4 should be provided with the proposal. The IT Management Plan (DRD-PIC-IT-01) and the IT Security Plan (DRD-PIC-IT-03) for off-site systems, as managed by the offeror, will be required for contract phase-in. The first submission date for DRD-PIC-IT-03 will be corrected.</p>
10	<p>Appendix L-5, Table L-2 (Page L-A5-4): Is the Government going to fill in Column 4 of Table L-2 and, if so, will it be consistent with the hours on the SPT (page L-A2-2), or are the numbers on the SPT strictly a costing exercise separate from the number of WYEs required to successfully execute the SOW and it is up to the offeror to determine the FY10 WYE allocation proposed in the resource tables as specified in Appendix L-6, Table L-3 (Page L-A6-4)?</p>	<p>No, the intent is that the Offerors fill in Column 4 of Table L.2</p>

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Draft Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

11	Section M, Section 6.0 (Page M-6): If past performance is not going to be weighted or scored, how does the government plan on using it as stated in Section M, Section 9.0 (Page M-7), since Past Performance is the only evaluation factor that is not numerically weighted or scored?	The Government will evaluate the Offerors past performance in accordance with FAR 15.305 and NFS 1815.305.
12	Section L, Attachment L-2, Past Performance Questionnaire (Page L-A2-3): Does the phrase “past 3 years from the date of proposal release” refer to the draft RFP or the final FRP? Could the Government provide a specific date?	Refers to the Final RFP release date. The date of the Final RFP release is posted on the procurement web-site.
13	What does a fixed rate mean?	Fully burdened hourly amount in relation to the corresponding standard labor category expressed as a dollar rate which is not subject to change in amount or time other than the amount proposed.
14	Who is the incumbent company?	The current International Space Station Program Integration and Control contractor is ARES Corporation.